



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/846,074	04/30/2001	Edward O. Clapper	INTL-0567-US (P11338)	4543

7590 07/09/2003
Timothy N. Trop
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
Ste. 100
8554 Katy Freeway
Houston, TX 77024

EXAMINER

DHARIA, PRABODH M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2673

DATE MAILED: 07/09/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/846,074

Applicant(s)

CLAPPER, EDWARD O.

Examiner

Prabodh M Dharia

Art Unit

2673

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2673

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is repeating information given in the title. Title information should be removed. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1,2,5,6,9,10,11,14,17,26, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Goodman et al. (6,100,875).

Regarding Claim 1, Goodman et al. teaches an apparatus (Col. 2, Lines 9,10) comprising:
an interface (Col. 5, Lines 18,19, Col. 5, Lines 26-34); and a controller communicatively coupled

Art Unit: 2673

to the interface (Col. 5, Lines 26-34, Col. 6, Lines 13-16, Lines 25-29), the controller to detect a key activation (Col. 5, Lines 35,36) and to adjust a cursor of a pointing device in response to detecting the key activation (Col. 2, Lines 9-11, Col. 3, lines 45-56).

Regarding Claim 2, Goodman et al. teaches the controller moves the cursor to a pre-selected area on a display device in response to detecting the key activation (Col. 2, Lines 9-11, Col. 3, lines 45-56).

Regarding Claim 5, Goodman et al. teaches the controller adjusts the cursor in response to activation of a selected key (Col. 4, Lines 58-64).

Regarding Claim 6, Goodman et al. teaches the controller adjusts the cursor until key activation is no longer detected (Col. 6, Lines 52-55).

Regarding Claim 9, Goodman et al. teaches the controller detects a selection of a key of a keyboard (Col.6, Lines 52-55, Col. 5, Lines 35-38).

Regarding Claim 10, Goodman et al. teaches a method, comprising: detecting a selection of at least one key of a keyboard; and adjusting a cursor of a pointing device in response to detecting the selection of the at least one key (Col.6, Lines 52-55, Col. 5, Lines 35-38, Col. 3, Lines 45-52).

Art Unit: 2673

Regarding Claim 11, Goodman et al. teaches the adjusting the cursor comprises moving the cursor to a pre-selected area of a graphical user interface (Col.6, Lines 52-55, Col. 5, Lines 35-38, Col. 3, Lines 45-52, Col. 3, Line 67 to Col. 4, Line 6).

Regarding Claim 14, Goodman et al. teaches the adjusting the cursor comprises adjusting the cursor based on a selection of a pre-selected key (Col. 4, Lines 58-64, Col. 3, Lines 45-51).

Regarding Claim 17, Goodman et al. teaches an article comprising one or more machine-readable storage media containing instructions that when executed enable a processor to: detect a key activation; and control a cursor of a pointing device in response to detecting the key activation (Col. 6, Lines 23-46, Col. 3, Lines 52).

Regarding Claim 26, Goodman et al. teaches a system comprising: a pointing device; a keyboard having one or more keys (Col. 6, Lines 59-62); and teaches an apparatus (Col. 2, Lines 9,10) comprising: an interface (Col. 5, Lines 18,19, Col. 5, Lines 26-34); and a controller communicatively coupled to the interface (Col. 5, Lines 26-34, Col. 6, Lines 13-16, Lines 25-29), the controller to detect a key activation (Col. 5, Lines 35,36) and to adjust a cursor of a pointing device in response to detecting the key activation (Col. 2, Lines 9-11, Col. 3, lines 45-56).

5. Claims 15,16,23-25, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Franz et al. (6,107,996).

Art Unit: 2673

Regarding Claim 15, Franz et al. teaches an article comprising one or more machine-readable storage media containing instructions that when executed enable a processor to: receive an option to control a cursor of a pointing device in response to detecting a key activation; and store the option in a storage unit (Col. 13, Line 62 to Col. 14, Line 17, Col. 22, Lines 40-47).

Regarding Claim 16, Franz et al. teaches the instructions when executed enable the processor to receive the option comprising at least one of moving the cursor to a pre-selected area on a display device, freezing the position of the cursor, and adjusting the size of the cursor (Col. 13, Line 62 to Col. 14, Line 17).

Regarding Claim 23, Franz et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: an interface; and a controller communicatively coupled to the interface, the controller to adjust a cursor of a pointing device during text-entry mode (Col. 10, Lines 25-67, Col. 24, Lines 10-13, Lines 19-44).

Regarding Claim 24, Franz et al. teaches the controller disables the movement of the cursor during the text-entry mode (Col. 16, Line 66 to Col. 17, Line 5).

Regarding Claim 25, Franz et al. teaches the controller adjust the cursor based on a location of a selected key during the text-entry mode relative to the location of the pointing device (Col. 24, Lines 10-13, Col. 16, Line 66 to Col. 17, Line 5).

Art Unit: 2673

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 3,4,13,18-22,28-30, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodman et al. (6,100,875) in view of Franz et al. (6,107,996).

Regarding Claim 3, Goodman et al. teaches the keyboard comprises the pointing device (Col. 6, Lines 59-62).

However, Goodman et al. fails to teach the controller prevents movement of the cursor in response to detecting the key activation

However, Franz et al. teaches the controller prevents movement of the cursor in response to detecting the key activation (Col. 13, Line 62 to Col. 14, Line 4).

Thus it is obvious to one in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate teaching of Franz et al. in Goodman et al. teaching for having a user friendly integrated keyboard with pointing device and reduce the restriction in operation as well as duplication of the hardware.

Regarding Claim 4, Franz et al. teaches the controller reduces at least one of a movement and sensitivity of the cursor in response to detecting the key activation (Col. 13, Line 62 to Col.

Art Unit: 2673

14, Line 4).

Regarding Claim 13, Franz et al. teaches the adjusting the cursor comprises preventing the cursor from moving (Col. 13, Line 62 to Col. 14, Line 4).

Regarding Claim 18, Franz et al. teaches the instructions when executed enable the processor to lock the cursor of the pointing device at a selected position in response to detecting the key activation (Col. 13, Line 62 to Col. 14, Line 17).

Regarding Claim 19, Franz et al. teaches the instructions when executed enable the processor to move the cursor of the pointing device to a selected area on a display device in response to detecting the key activation (Col. 23, Lines 36-43, Lines 52-60).

Regarding Claim 21, Franz et al. teaches the instructions when executed enable the processor to adjust the sensitivity of the pointing device in response to detecting the key activation (Col. 10, Lines 7-24).

Regarding Claim 22, Franz et al. teaches the instructions when executed enable the processor to control the cursor of the pointing device based on the key activation of one or more pre-selected keys (Col. 22, Lines 4-34).

Art Unit: 2673

Regarding Claim 28, Franz et al. teaches the instructions when executed enable the processor to move the cursor of the pointing device to a selected area on a display device in response to detecting the key activation (Col. 23, Lines 36-43, Lines 52-60).

Regarding Claim 29, Franz et al. teaches the controller prevents the cursor from moving in response to detecting the activation of the one or more keys of the keyboard (Col. 22, Lines 29-34).

Regarding Claim 30, Franz et al. teaches the controller stops adjusting the cursor of the pointing device if no activation (searching to see if any key has been pressed) of the one or more keys is detected (Col. 23, Lines 6-10).

8. Claims 7,8,27, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodman et al. (6,100,875) in view of Thorne, III et al. (5,805,165).

Regarding Claim 7, Goodman et al. teaches the keyboard comprises the pointing device (Col. 6, Lines 59-62).

However, Goodman et al. fails to teach the controller hides the cursor from view in response to detecting the key activation.

However, Thorne, III et al. teaches the controller hides the cursor from view in response to detecting the key activation (Col. 13, Lines 8-12).

Art Unit: 2673

Thus it is obvious to one in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate teaching of Thorne, III et al. in Goodman et al. teaching for improvements in a cursor control movement and better cursor positioning control in a display.

Regarding Claim 8, Thorne, III et al. teaches the controller adjusts the cursor of one of a trackball device, touch pad device, and mouse device (Col. 9, Lines 13-20, Col. 9, Lines 20-27).

Regarding Claim 27, Goodman et al. teaches the keyboard comprises the pointing device (Col. 6, Lines 59-62); and Thorne, III et al. teaches the controller adjusts the cursor of one of a trackball device, touch pad device, and mouse device (Col. 9, Lines 13-20, Col. 9, Lines 20-27).

9. Claim 12, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodman et al. (6,100,875) in view of Ito (5,852,431).

Regarding Claim 12, Goodman et al. teaches the keyboard comprises the pointing device (Col. 6, Lines 59-62).

However, Goodman et al. fails to teach the adjusting the cursor comprises re-sizing (re-shaping) the cursor in response to detecting the selection of the at least one key.

However, Ito et al. teaches the adjusting the cursor comprises re-sizing (re-shaping) the cursor in response to detecting the selection of the at least one key (Col. 10, Lines 37,38).

Thus it is obvious to one in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate teaching of Ito in Goodman et al. teaching for improvements in a cursor control

Art Unit: 2673

movement, as well as re-shaping (re-sizing) the cursor and better cursor positioning control in a display.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is informed that all of the other additional cited references render the claims obvious.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Shima (6,084,589) Information retrieval Apparatus.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prabodh M Dharia whose telephone number is 703-605-1231. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8AM to 5PM.

13. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on 703-305-4938. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9341 for regular communications and 703-872-9341 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2673

14. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4750.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

PD

AU2673

July 2, 2003

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Vijay Shankar', with a stylized, flowing script.

VIJAY SHANKAR
PRIMARY EXAMINER